UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                       | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/710,290  | 06/30/2004                         | Brian Jay McFarlane  | 717119.450          | 4289             |  |
|   | 7590 04/04/200<br>CKWELL SANDERS L |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| 720 OLIVE STREET<br>SUITE 2400<br>ST. LOUIS, MO 63101 |                                    |                      | THAKUR, VIREN A     |                  |  |
|   |                                    |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |                                    |                      | 1794                |                  |  |
|   |                                    |                      |                     |                  |  |
|   |                                    |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |                                    |                      | 04/04/2008          | ELECTRONIC       |  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto-sl@huschblackwell.com

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |        |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Occurrence   | 10/710,290  | MCFARLANE ET A  | AL.    |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |        |  |  |  |
|  | VIREN THAKUR  | 1794  |        |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence add   | dress  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | <b>J.</b> nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |        |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |   |   |        |  |  |  |
|  | _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowan  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E   |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-47</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  | vn from consideration.  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.   | ·   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | 8) Claim(s)is/are objected to: 8) Claim(s) <u>1-47</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  |   |        |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | nootion roquii omone.   |   |        |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the o  | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |   |        |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti  | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |   |        |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | aminer. Note the attached Office  | Action or form PT   | O-152. |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |        |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of</li> </ul>  | s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | on No ed in this National :   | Stage  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:   | nte   |        |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/710,290 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-26,31-46, drawn to a method of packaging fresh meat, classified in class 426, subclass 395.
- II. Claims 27-28, drawn to an apparatus for packaging fresh meat, classified in class 99, subclass 467
- III. Claims 29-30 and 47, drawn to a packaged meat product, classified in class 426, subclass 118.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus, as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. For instance the apparatus can be used to flush the gas for a non-edible products comprised of oxidizing metals, that are sensitive to oxygen, such as an antique gun.

Application/Control Number: 10/710,290

Art Unit: 1794

3. Inventions II and III are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used for making a materially different product, such as to protect oxygen sensitive products such as antique guns or pharmaceutical products. Also, the product can be made by another materially and different apparatus, such as a container which already has ports that are used to flush gases into the container, as opposed to using a chamber of invention I.

Page 3

- 4. Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product of group III, as claimed can be made by another and materially different process. For instance, in the product of group III, the gas can be flushed without allowing partial penetration into the food, prior to flushing with a second gas.
- 5. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above

and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement

will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

Art Unit: 1794

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIREN THAKUR whose telephone number is (571)272-6694. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571)272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V. T./ Examiner, Art Unit 1794 /Steve Weinstein/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794